



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*trāce* by the side of *Trace*, while *charge*, *large*, *targe* are marked with the long *ā*, but *farse*, *Tars* are left short. The fact that Chaucer uses the forms *list*, *lest* is not convincing proof of an invariable Southwestern *ū* in *lust*, which might just as well arise from OE. *lust* as from OE. *lyst*,<sup>2</sup> cf. Morsbach, *ME. Gram.* § 129, 2, p. 170; *Trāce* has the long *ā*; and although the orthoepists of the sixteenth century allow either the short or the long *ā* in *charge*, *large*, etc., yet it might have been better for the student if the editor had left them unmarked, since the modern pronunciation points invariably to a Middle English short *ǣ* in words of this class. An apparent exception is the word *scarce*(ly), which doubtless owes its pronunciation with *ē* to the influence of *sc*.

The text follows the orthography and readings of the Ellesmere MS., while essential variants given in each instance at the foot of the page furnish all the material necessary for a study of the relations of the MSS. Now and then the editor would seem to have rejected the reading of the Ellesmere MS. without sufficient grounds. Thus, *were*, *Prol.* 578, is substituted for *weren*, in which the *e* could be slurred as in v. 455; *it*, *Prol.* 1091, which is omitted in the El. MS., is scarcely necessary; 1573 reads: "A longe tyme, and afterward he upsterte," an extremely awkward line, instead of the simple "A longe tyme, and after he upsterte," of the El. MS. In the main, however, Prof. Liddell has displayed excellent judgment in his choice of variants, a notable instance being the insertion of the historical present *rit*, which the scribe of the El. MS. altered to the preterit *rood* with a view to avoiding the combination of the two tenses *took . . . rit*—a combination that is in no small degree characteristic of Chaucer's style: see A. 957, 966, 999, 1217, 1633, 1782.

One familiar with the pages of the Student's Chaucer will be struck at once by a number of rather important changes in the pointing of certain passages. For instance, a period stands after *strondes*, *Prol.* 13, "to ferne halwes," etc., being taken with "they wende," v. 16; *leet*, v. 175, is regarded as a transitive in the

<sup>2</sup> *Lystis* is not given in either *Bosworth and Toller* or *Sweet's A.-S. Dict.*

sense of "neglect," with v. 173 as its object, while the words "olde thynges pace" are put in the form of a parenthesis; a dash instead of the usual period ends A. 1138, so that vv. 1137, 1138 go with what follows, not with what precedes; a colon follows *forȳeten*, A. 2021, and the force of the phrase "by the infortune of Marte" falls, therefore, on the following line.

In order to keep the edition within text-book limits, it was necessary to make the Notes somewhat brief, a defect that can be offset to some extent by a free use of the Glossary. Among the sins of omission may be counted the failure to explain the words *brouke*, B. 4490, *deye*, B. 4036, *veze*, A. 1985; and it is also a matter of regret that the Notes are not entirely free from the mistakes of former editors. Thus, Flügel has shown conclusively, in *Anglia*, xxiii, 2, 233 ff., that *rente*, *Prol.* 256, does not mean "income": "Der frere, will Ch. sagen, behielt noch von seinem erbettelten ein schönes sümmchen (wel bettre) übrig über seine pachtsumme." Again, the editor accepts Skeat's note on the *Prol.* 212, 213, apparently not being acquainted with the explanation that Flügel has given of this difficult passage: see the *Jour. of Germ. Phil.* i. 133 ff.

The following misprints may be noted: p. lvii, *ēre* should be *ðēre*; p. lix, *liegan* should be *licgan*, and *fēren*, *fēran*; p. xcvi, fn., *containg* should be *containing*; *Prol.* 16, for *Caunturbury*, read *Caunterbury*; p. 216, *thēre* should be *thēre*.

The errors of detail that have been pointed out above detract little from the accuracy and completeness of the book, which, as a whole, can be heartily commended to all who desire to study Chaucer's language.

WILLIAM A. READ.

University of Arkansas.

### SCANDINAVIAN PHILOLOGY.

#### *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English.*

Part I, by ERIC BJÖRKMAN, Ph. D., Upsala: N. T. S. Boktryckeri-Aktiebolag, 1900. 191 pp.

THE author is already known to students of English Philology through his short but schol-

arly treatise "Zur dialektischen Provenienz der nordischen Lehnwörter im Englischen," printed in *Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapet i Upsala Förhandlingar* (Transactions of the Philological Society of Upsala), 1898-1901, and also as a separate pamphlet, Upsala, 1900, in which are discussed the phonology and etymology of a list of Scandinavian loan-words in English, their provenience and geographical distribution. The author's thorough grasp of his subject and the method of handling the most difficult questions that the problem involves promised valuable results in the discussion of ME. loan-words that was to follow. Part I of the larger work now before us is characterized by the same scholarly thoroughness in treatment and perfect fairness in attitude and forms a most important contribution to the study of the relation of English to Scandinavian.

The author bases his researches largely on ME. material. OE. material is regarded as inadequate for a satisfactory treatment of the subject because of the comparative meagreness of Scandinavian elements, something that is accounted for partly by the fact that Northern English of the time is not sufficiently represented in literature, and partly by the fact that the main body of loan-words seems to have been introduced in the eleventh century, and does not appear in literature before the ME. period. Furthermore, the Scandinavian elements in OE. are of a different kind from those that appear in the eleventh century, the former being of a more learned character, largely legal and technical terms, while the loan-elements that appear in ME. are of the speech of the people,—the result of a very intimate blending of two languages. Nor does the author believe that the modern dialects can be made the chief basis for the study, because of the uncertainty that characterizes the phonology of the dialects. Many changes are of comparatively recent date, which makes the criteria of loan uncertain, and often quite unreliable. For this reason a knowledge of ME. conditions is regarded as necessary to a reliable and satisfactory treatment of the material contained in the modern dialects. A difficulty attendant upon the general problem of Scandinavian influence on English is the limited

knowledge that we possess of Old Northern English and the similarity in form and vocabulary as between Old Norse and Anglian. Scandinavian influence on English inflexions and derivations does not come within the scope of the author's treatise. By way of exemplification the frequency of the ME. and Mn. E. verbal suffixes *l* and *n* is pointed out as possibly due to Scandinavian influence. Attention is called to the fact that a great number of these verbs seem to be loan-words, and from these loan-words the suffix may have spread to word-stems of English origin. A partial list of verbs of this class, mostly from ME., is given on p. 15. In support of the author's conjecture it may be pointed out that in English dialects *l*- and *n*-suffix verbs are especially numerous in the dialects of northern and northwestern England, and in general where Scandinavian elements are most prominent. *L*-suffix verbs are especially numerous in these dialects. The present reviewer has collected over two hundred that occur in the dialects of Cumberland and Yorkshire. These formations are very characteristic of all the Scandinavian languages and Scandinavian influence seems highly probable in NE. dialects and in certain ME. texts. To the author's list of words illustrative of Scandinavian influence on inflection may be added M. Sco. *apert*, boldly, with neuter-adverbial *l* and *melder* and *leister* (Burns) with inflectional *r*, as also perhaps *caller* (Fergusson).

Under the various criteria of loan taken up in the order of vowels, diphthongs and consonants are discussed words of Scandinavian origin, their form, meaning and distribution in ME. texts: i, tests based on prehistoric differences between Scandinavian and West Teutonic; ii, tests based on differences between Scandinavian and English sound development. Section ii is subdivided into: A. Distinctively Scandinavian diphthongs and vowels in Scandinavian loan-words, pp. 36-118, where about two hundred and twenty-five words are discussed; B. tests chiefly depending on differences as to the development of consonants in English and Scandinavian, about two hundred and fifty words discussed. Under the latter head twenty pages are devoted to Scandinavian *sk* and words that fall under this

head. OE. *sc*, initially, medially, and finally seems to have become ME. *ȝ*, except in some cases medially and finally where it has apparently developed out of OE. *cs*, *x*, ME. *ks*, *x* by metathesis. This sound is in ME. represented by *sh*, *sch*, or in southern texts by *s*, *ss*. Where *sk* (*sc*) appears, then, it must be due to foreign influence—Latin, Celtic or Romance if non-Teutonic, Scandinavian if Teutonic, except in the case of words of recent introduction where German influence has been shown to exist. The author regards ME. *sk* as in the main due to Scandinavian influence. Something over one hundred words in *sk* are discussed, in many of which, usually taken as Scandinavian, *sk* is rejected as a sign of Scandinavian influence. *Sk* is not, however, always a sign of Scan. loan, for there are in Mn. Eng. dialects, and standard speech native words in *sk*, and on the other hand, many undoubted Scand. words have the sound *ȝ*. No attempt has been made to explain this difficulty. The author argues

"that both nationalities held, especially some time after the settlement of the Northerners, a very close intercourse with each other, and therefore each side must have had a fairly good knowledge of the language of the other. In adopting words from Scandinavian the English must, therefore, have been able to give the loan-words, which did not agree with the phonological conditions of their language, a thoroughly English form, and they must also, although unconsciously, have had a fairly good etymological knowledge of Scandinavian which enabled them to replace Scandinavian sounds by their English equivalents, and sometimes they coined words, esp. compounds, simply by translation from Scandinavian. . . . People who to some extent knew both languages saw, without any difficulty, the etymological identity of English *ȝ* and Scandinavian *sk*, and this the more easily as there existed in both languages a considerable number of words which—but for the difference of *sk*, *ȝ*—were absolutely identical as to form and meaning. Bilingual individuals, when speaking English, had to pronounce *ȝ* in the same words which they pronounced with *sk*, when speaking Scandinavian. This may have led to confusion of several kinds. *Sk* has practically remained in many loan-words from Scandinavian, very often side by side with etymologically identical native words in *ȝ*; this may have led to the introduction of *sk* even in words which did not exist in Scandinavian. Such a word is perhaps ME. *scateren* by the

side of genuine English *shateren*. Words containing *sk* introduced from Scandinavian, may easily have been 'Anglicised' and pronounced with *ȝ*." (pp. 9-10).

Scandinavian words are in ME. written with *sc* or *sk*, but in several ME. manuscripts OE. *sc* is kept for the sound *ȝ*. There is then in such cases no test of loan. In manuscripts of this kind the author regards *sk* as a Scand. sign, as, for example, in the Cotton MS. of *Cursor Mundi*. While *sc* is used most frequently for *ȝ* in the Cotton MS. of C. M. the writing with *sk* cannot be regarded as a safe criterion of loan from Scand. for while *sk* appears predominantly in words that were always pronounced with *sk*, not *ȝ*, *sk* does appear in some cases where there can be little doubt that the sound was *s*. The word "shaking" is in C. M. Cotton MS. 26047, written *skaking* (Fairfax MS. has *shacand*). On the other hand *sch* does not always represent the *ȝ*-sound, cp. *schillwisness* (first element <ON. *skil*), *schrews* "screws," *schured*=*scured*, "scoured," *schale*=*skail*, scatter, *schete*=*skete*, quick. To the author's discussion of ON. *ð* may be added that *d* (<ON. *ð*) is particularly frequent in M. Sco. as well as in the modern dialects of northwestern England and Scotland generally, especially in the final position, cp., for example, M. Sco. *heid*, brightness (Rolland), ON. *hæið*; *red*, to clear away (Ratis Raving), ON. *ryðja*; *styðdy* (Douglas, Dunbar), ON. *steði*. The reviewer does not think that the spelling with *ð* in ME. *lesen* by the side of *laisen* (*Cursor Mundi*) proves a simple vowel. The diphthong is variously written *a*, *ai*, *ay*, *e*, *ei* and *ey* in the *Cursor Mundi*. *Lesen* and *laisen* are, then, only two different ways of writing the same word (cp. *dey*, *de*; *pai*, *pei*, *pe*; *pare*, *pere*, *pere*, *pair*; *wayk*, *waike*, *wek*). Nor is *ē* in OIr. *hēle* to be taken as a sign of East Scandinavian monophthongization, the simplification of the vowel in this word has probably taken place on Irish soil. Beside *sōm*, trace of a cart, p. 72, from ON. *saumr*, might also have been mentioned the more original form *soum* which occurs in Dunbar. I do not think that northern dialectal *glout* necessarily points to a *ū*-vowel in ME. (cp. Cumberland, Westmoreland *blowt*, *gowk*, *gowl*, *how*, *cowp*, etc.). The ON. source of NE. dial. *beace* is further

supported by the *i*-fracture, from ON. *bās* then as is suggested, p. 99. It does not seem quite satisfactory to derive *swaype* from OE. *swipe*, as is done on p. 59. It is noteworthy that the rhyme *swaype: raip* occurs in *Cursor Mundi*, 24023, which suggests a diphthong in *swaype* if the etymology of *raip* given on p. 49 be correct. *Raip* occurs in rhyme three times with the word *snaipe* (<ON. *snöyppa*), which proves the author's etymology of *raip* to be the correct one, and at the same time strengthens the case against the English origin of *swaype*.

Dr. Björkman's work shows extensive research and is a model of scholarly exactness and thoroughness. It is by far the most important contribution to the study of the linguistic relations of English and Scandinavian that has yet appeared.

GEORGE T. FLOW.

University of Iowa.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Grundriss der neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte*, von RICHARD M. MEYER. Berlin: Bondi, 1902, 258 pp. M. 7.

PROF. RICHARD M. MEYER, to whom we owe the first satisfactory history of nineteenth-century literature in Germany, here gives us a by-product of his studies for this work, in the form of a voluminous bibliography. In thus filling the yawning gap between the latest fascicle of Goedeke and the present day, and at the same time booking in convenient form the best material furnished by the indispensable but time-consuming *Jahresberichte* and other helps of the kind, Prof. Meyer has done a great service to all students of "post-classical" German literature. The immense labor involved in such a work as this *Grundriss* can be appreciated only by one who has gone over somewhat similar ground himself. The writer of these lines, having attempted a more modest task of the same nature, and knowing what a vast amount of time and trouble this book would have saved him if it had appeared a year or so earlier, would be the last to underestimate its value; the criticisms and corrections that follow are not given in a carping spirit, but rather with the desire of contributing

to the perfecting of a most important publication.

The arrangement of the *Grundriss* is naturally based upon that of the author's *Die deutsche Litteratur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, and it is subject to the same objections and to the same defense. One advantage of the periodic system adopted is that it suggests interesting groups of documents on the general character of the successive decades; in these, as everywhere, the author's immensely wide reading in the literature of the century enables him to give innumerable valuable indications that are nowhere else to be found. In fact, the whole book is full of suggestive chips from the workshop of a first-class authority, perhaps the best, of all authorities, on the period in question, and so it has a living value and interest that is lacking in any mere list of titles. Good suggestions are given here and there as to practical methods of study, useful lists of "principal works" are appended for too prolific authors, and helpful hints are added on the value of the critical and biographical works catalogued. These laconic criticisms might be extended with profit to many more titles, for too often the good and the comparatively worthless still stand side by side without a tag to mark their relative value.

Prof. Meyer, as his preface shows, recognizes theoretically the vital importance of a full index to a work of this nature. Unfortunately, he has failed to make a satisfactory practical application of this insight. As the whole book is a time-saving device, it is all the stranger that no account is taken of the time that might be saved the user by a complete index. And the index is not only far from complete, but lacking in system as well. It does not appear, for instance, why Nos. 210-12, 216, 231 should be indexed, and not Nos. 214, 215, 229, 230, taking just a few at random. The principle should be to index the name of every author and editor in the entire bibliography.

To the data given in the bibliography, either the price, or the number of pages, or both, should be added. It is often quite as important to know the approximate bulk of a book as its date, and the cost is pretty sure to be a matter of practical interest to users of the bibliography who are remote from great libra-